

## Faulk, Camilla

---

**From:** Carroll, Edward [ECARROLL@spokanecounty.org]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 14, 2011 9:24 AM  
**To:** Faulk, Camilla  
**Subject:** Proposed changes to CrR 4.11

I support the proposed changes to CrR 4.11. Accuracy in all phases of preparation of a case for either resolution or trial is absolutely critical. It makes little sense to use archaic methods to memorialize crucial information when modern recording methods are readily available. One might think that recordings of interviews could foster additional litigation of criminal cases, but I believe in fact the opposite will occur. Not only does accuracy tend to limit confusion in trial, but also defendants are trying to assess their cases prior to trial. When defendants can hear the interviews of crucial witnesses, they will know and should have no illusions about what they will face at trial. And even where impeachment is concerned, hearing a witness' prior statement in that person's own voice is more powerful than simply a comment from counsel about what was supposedly said.

Much of what is presented in the usual criminal trial consists of the testimony of witnesses. Even when there are items of physical evidence, those items are often tied into the case via witness testimony. We have accuracy in physical evidence--it is what it is. Why not have the same, readily available level of accuracy in what witnesses have said in pre-trial interview? I support the proposed changes to CrR 4.11 for all of these reasons, and I am sure there are more than I have thought of here.

Ed Carroll, WSBA# 15615, Attorney II, Counsel For Defense, Spokane, WA